

REMARKS:

In the foregoing amendments, claims 1, 2-6, 10, and 12 were amended; claim 7 was canceled; and claims 17 and 18 were added to the application. Editorial changes were made to claims 1, 2-5, 11, and 12. Claim 6 was amended to better define the invention set forth therein. New claims 17 and 18 correspond to claims 1 and 2, but define applicant's invention differently. Accordingly, claims 1-6 and 8-18 are in the application for consideration at this time.

Claims 1-5 and 10-16 were rejected on the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Official action stated that in claim 1, line 11, the phrase "the individual display segments" lacks clear antecedent basis. The Official action continued that the same problem is found in claim 2, line 9. In the foregoing amendments to applicant's claims, the aforesaid phrase "the individual display segments" was amended to "individual display segments." Accordingly, there is no longer an antecedent basis problem for this phrase in applicant's claims. For these reasons, applicant respectfully submits that all the claims in this application particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Therefore,

applicant respectfully requests that the examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

The Official action set forth a single prior art rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent No. 5,648,755 of Yagihashi *et al.* (Yagihashi). This rejection is set forth on pages 2-4 of the Official action. The Official action took the position that the indicators 701 and 711 in figure 6A of Yagihashi are "state indication marks," and that the enlarged 701 and 711 indicators in figure 6C are "state change indication marks" because they are responsive to a state change. The Official action further stated that reducing the size of such indicators makes them "unindicative" while enlarging the size of such indicators makes them "indicative."

Applicant respectfully submits that the presently claimed invention is patently distinguishable from the teachings of Yagihashi within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at least the following reasons.

In particular, applicant respectfully submits that the arrangement proposed by Yagihashi is quite different from the presently claimed invention, such as that set forth in claims 1, 2, 17, and 18. Attention is respectfully directed figures to 1A and 1B of the present application that correspond to present claims 1 and 17. In applicant's claims, when the predetermined state indication mark, as displayed in a predetermined one of the individual display

segment is made unindicative, the predetermined mark (icon) no longer can be seen or viewed on the display. Compare, for example, segment 30 in figures 1A and 1B of applicant's specification disclosure. In figure 1A, segment 30 contains mark 31. However, segment 30 in figure 1B does not contain mark 31 in segment 30; but rather, contains marks 33 and 34 -- mark 31 can no longer be seen on the display. When a mark is made unindicative in applicant's claimed invention, the mark can no longer be viewed or seen on the display. This can be achieved by, for example, removing the mark from the display segment, placing another mark over the mark, etc. This is explained in applicant's specification disclosure at page 11, lines 15-24, page 23, lines 1-4, and elsewhere. In claims 2 and 18, the state indication mark, as displayed in the predetermined display segment, is made unindicative and a predetermined state indication mark is displayed in said predetermined display segment. This is explained in applicant's specification disclosure at page 14, lines 2-12, and elsewhere. The teachings of Yagihashi do not contemplate or suggest making a display segment unindicative. In other words, any reducing or enlarging of an icon as proposed in Yagihashi cannot contemplate or suggest making the mark (icon) unindicative in accordance with applicant's claims, which requires making a mark unindicative (i.e., removing the mark from the display or otherwise inhibiting view of the mark (icon)) and replacing it with another

mark. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that the presently claimed invention is patently distinguishable from the teachings of Yagihashi.

Claims 3-5, 13, and 15 depend from claim 1; and claims 10-12, 14, and 16 depend from claim 2. Claims 3 and 10 require, *inter alia*, that the predetermined state indication mark, which is made unindicative (i.e., removed from display) has a lowest priority for the display of the state indication marks displayed in the individual display segments on the display screen. Claims 4 and 11 define, *inter alia*, that another of the individual display segments on the display screen other than the predetermined display segment does not change when the state of the working machine makes a change. Claims 5 and 12 require, *inter alia*, that when a change corresponding to the predetermined state change indication mark occurs while the state indication mark is being displayed in the predetermined display segment, both the state change indication mark being displayed and the predetermined state change indication mark are displayed in the predetermined display segment. Claims 13 and 14 define, *inter alia*, that a display size of at least one of the plurality of state indication marks other than the predetermined state indication mark (the one that is removed) is reduced, when the state of the working machine makes a change. On the other hand, claims 14 and 15 require, *inter alia*, that a display size of at least one of the plurality of state indication marks other than the predetermined state indication mark (the one that is removed) is enlarged,

when the state of the working machine makes a change. The teachings of Yagihashi do not disclose or suggest these aspects of applicant's claimed invention either alone or in conjunction with the limitations set forth in claims 1 and 2. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-5 and 12-16 are patently distinguishable from the teachings of Yagihashi.

Present claim 6 requires, *inter alia*, that when a predetermined signal is inputted, a predetermined one of the plurality of marks being displayed on the display screen is made unindicative *by removing display thereof* and a predetermined mark corresponding to the predetermined signal is displayed in the display segment in which the predetermined mark was displayed. In summary, claim 6 requires that a displayed mark is removed and replaced with another mark corresponding to a signal that is inputted, among other things. The teachings of Yagihashi do not disclose or suggest these aspects of applicant's claimed invention. Claims 8 and 9 also define changes in the plurality of marks displayed on the display screen in response to input of a predetermined signal. Claim 8 further defines, *inter alia*, that a predetermined mark being displayed in a predetermined display segment on the display screen is displayed at a reduced scale, *and a different mark* from the reduced and displayed mark is displayed in a portion of the predetermined display segment, where the predetermined mark is reduced. Claim 9 further defines, *inter alia*, that a predetermined mark corresponding to the inputted signal is displayed in

a display segment different from the display segment of the plurality of marks, and that the predetermined mark is enlarged and displayed for a predetermined time *over* the predetermined one of the plurality of marks displayed on the display screen. The teachings of Yagihashi do not disclose or suggest these limitations in claims 6, 8, and 9. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claims 6, 8, and 9 are patently distinguishable from the teachings of Yagihashi.

In accordance with the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the presently claimed invention is distinguishable from the teachings of Yagihashi within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests that the examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection set forth in the outstanding Office action of applicant's claims over these teachings.

Based on the above, a formal allowance of claims 1-6 and 8-18 is respectfully requested. While it is believed that all the claims in this application are in condition for allowance, should the examiner have any comments or questions, it is respectfully requested that the undersigned be telephoned at the below listed number to resolve any outstanding issues.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, applicant hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fee therefor, as well as any other fees which become due, may be charged to our deposit account No. 22-0256.

Respectfully submitted,
VARNDELL & VARNDELL, PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Eugene Varndell, Jr.", is written over a horizontal line. A large, loopy flourish extends from the end of the signature, looping around the text below.

R. Eugene Varndell, Jr.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,728

Atty. Case No. VX012330
106-A S. Columbus St.
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 683-9730

\\V:\VDOCS\W_DOCS\JAN05\PO-152-2330 RS.DOC